

Canadian
Pamphlets
3356

Nimmo, Joseph, 1837-1909

Canadian protection compared
with the provisions of the McKinley
Tariff Act. [n.p., 1890?]

CANADIAN PROTECTION

COMPARED WITH THE PROVISIONS OF

THE MCKINLEY TARIFF ACT.

A REPLY TO SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S
SPEECH AT HALIFAX,

BY

JOSEPH NIMMO, JR.
"11

[From the *New York Tribune* of October 24th, 1890.]

CANADA AND THE TARIFF.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD'S RECENT SPEECH AT HALIFAX REVIEWED
BY MR. NIMMO.

Sir John Macdonald's recent tirade at Halifax against the McKinley bill—now a law—exhibits that doughty Canadian ruler in the attitude of a mad bull in the pasture of political endeavor, tossing facts and philosophy to the winds. But Sir John is astute. There is a method in his madness. His speech was intended for "home consumption," and not for export to the United States. But even the imperious Canadian ruler is unable to put a hook into the nose of the "chiel amang ye takin' notes."

In the light of recent Canadian history Sir John Macdonald's speech is absurd to the last degree. He attacks the protective features of the McKinley bill, while the party of which he is not only leader but absolute autocrat rode into power in the year 1878 upon an out-and-out protectionist platform. Ever since, that party has been securely entrenched in power by firmly adhering to a more pronounced protectionist policy than was ever proclaimed in the United States by William D. Kelley or William McKinley or James G. Blaine. Sir John and his followers have never ceased to proclaim the absolute necessity of protecting the manufacturing, mining, transportation, and commercial interests of Canada, nor to follow that policy. Occasionally Mr. Erastus Wiman, with his free-trade followers in Canada, charges upon the Canadian protectionist phalanx, but such efforts always turn out as did the attempt of the cow to oppose the railway train, mentioned by old George Stephenson—"bad for the cow." "Ooo."

Occasionally, when free-trade members of the Canadian Parliament become ostreperous, Sir John mops up the parliamentary floor with them at Ottawa in a manner which sets the Dominion in a roar of laughter, from Halifax to Vancouver. The Protective tariff of Canada lays duties upon products of British manufacture precisely as upon those of other countries. If a Canadian free-trader on the floor of Parliament is so indiscreet as to hint that this is disloyalty to the British government, Sir John flies into a dramatic rage, declaring that he is first of all a Canadian and "for home rule to the hilt"—whatever that may mean—but he goes out upon the hustings, and with tears in his eyes proclaims his undying love for the mother country. The ground upon which this cheap loyalty rests was clearly set forth by Sir John in his Halifax speech. By simply "waving the British flag," Canada secures both the moral and physical support of the British navy. In order to enforce this idea he asked, "What would Canada do in the Behring Sea controversy without England behind her?"

Sir John Macdonald is a statesman of the highest order, a man of wonderful administrative ability, cunning, resourceful, and courageous. He scorns consistency in the methods and expedients by which he carries out his designs, and seems to have an especial fondness for short turns. He is, perhaps, the most accomplished political gymnast of the age. The Canadians take great delight in the fact that "nobody can tell what Sir John will do next week." But he holds them always with a firm grasp by the magic of his wonderful powers. This phenomenal personal rule with its manifold solecisms and incongruities naturally furnishes a fruitful field to the political satirist. But unfortunately such opportunity for humor is lost upon the people of the United States, and for the reason stated by *The Tribune* a few days ago—our utter indifference to Canadian affairs. It is a melancholy fact that Canada can't even get into *Puck* or *Judge*. If the most skilful artist of either of those pictorials should present the best possibly conceived Canadian cartoon with the redoubtable Premier as the principal figure, the great

mass of our people would gaze upon it in blank wonderment and inquire, "Who is Sir John Macdonald?"

In passing, the fact must be noted that protection in Canada has a fierceness and aggressiveness which does not characterize the protective policy of the United States. The protective policy of this country is confined to the use of the right arm of import duties, whereas Canada uses for the same purpose the right arm of import duties, the left arm of export duties, and besides employs as a sort of kicking arrangement "Orders-in-Council," which, in plain English, means the sweet will of Sir John Macdonald. This latter expedient constitutes the sort of financial exploitation on account of which Charles I was so unfortunate as to lose his head on the morning of January 30, 1649. The "Order-in-Council" policy having failed to work satisfactorily upon British subjects, it has been relegated to duty as an adjunct of the British and Canadian foreign policy. It is a fact that the official volume containing the Canadian "Orders-in-Council" is considerably larger than the volume of Canadian Customs laws.

But let us glance for a moment at the Canadian tariff on imports in order to see how it compares with that of the United States. The following table is compiled from the most recent Canadian tariff, and the new McKinley tariff act:

	<i>Canadian duty.</i>	<i>United States duty.</i>
Green peas.....	25 per cent.	2-3 ct. per lb.
Strawberries, blackberries, and raspberries.....	3 cts. per lb.	Free.
Currants.....	1 ct. per qt.	Free.
Pears.....	25 per cent.	Free.
Peaches.....	1 ct. per lb.	Free.
Tomatoes.....	30 cts. per bush. and 10 p. c. ad val.	25 per cent.
Cherries, apricots, &c.....	1 ct. per lb.	Free.
Household furniture.....	35 per cent.	35 per cent.
Carriages and wagons.....	35 per cent.	35 per cent.
Cut nails and spikes.....	1 ct. per lb.	1 ct. per lb.
Mowing machines.....	35 per cent.	45 per cent.
Tea.....	10 per cent.	Free.
Coffee.....	10 per cent.	Free.

Early fruits and other products of the United States which are cheaper than similar products of Canada on account of

the milder climate of this country, are, as a rule, protected in Canada by duties higher than those laid upon such products by our own Government.

Taking the entire dutiable list of the two countries the average ad valorem rate on imports into the United States is about eight to ten per cent. higher than that of Canada, but considering the higher rates of wages which prevail in the United States consequent upon superior conditions and the protection of our much more valuable markets, the Canadian tariff on imports is more highly protective than is that of the United States.

The fact as to the higher rates of wages and superior conditions in the United States is evidenced by the influx of more than a million Canadians into this country during the last fifteen years, comprising mainly the youth and vigor of the Dominion.

But, as stated, Canadian import duties fall far short of embracing the whole scheme of Canadian protection to which Sir John Macdonald and his party are fully committed. That object is also accomplished by Canadian export duties, by Orders-in-Council, and by discriminating legislation of various sorts, going to the extent of inhumanity, the violation of the comity of nations, and actual aggression upon American interests. This is shown by the following facts :

(a) When the United States made logs free of duty Canada put an export duty on logs in order to protect her own sawmills.

(b) For the protection of two or three Canadian wrecking companies the Dominion Government refuses to allow American wrecking vessels to go to the relief of American vessels and seamen in distress in Canadian waters, although this results sometimes in loss of life. This inhumanity goes in the face of the fact that the United States Government has for twelve years held out to Canada an offer of reciprocity in this regard.

(c) Canada protects her shipping on the Lakes by discriminating entrance and clearance fees. She also protects her canals and the city of Montreal by a discriminating toll of

18 cents a ton on western products of this country, as against American Lake ports ; and this is done by an annual Order-in-Council in violation of the express provisions of the treaty of Washington.

(d) Canada protects her commerce by a discriminating duty of 10 per cent. on tea and coffee "when imported from the United States," and by a discriminating duty of 20 per cent. on silver coin of the United States, an expedient which has no parallel in the fiscal policy of any civilized country.

(e) Canada protects her great political railroad by a subvention of \$215,000,000 in gifts and loans, and by a statute which in terms exempts it from any penalty on account of unjust discrimination against competing railroads in the United States.

(f) Canada protects her ocean steamer lines on the Atlantic and on the Pacific by open subsidy to an extent which surpasses even the protective provisions of the two shipping bills now pending in Congress, and thus is deflecting American commerce from American ships and American seaports.

(g) Canada protects her fishing interests by inhumanities toward American fishermen which Secretary Manning characterized as "acts of barbarism fit only for savages," and by levying backsheesh upon American fishing vessels to the extent of \$1.50 a ton under a so-called *modus vivendi*, while as declared by Secretary Manning "this Department (the Treasury Department) protects Canadian fishermen in the use of American ports." This state of affairs continues until the present day as "unfinished business," to the rectification of which the Republican party stands pledged, and which it will presumably rectify before the expiration of the Fifty-first Congress.

Canada has escaped retaliatory measures against these aggressive acts only as her conduct has escaped observation in this country. Sir John's tirade at Halifax can only serve the good purpose of bringing these acts out into the open where they can be observed, and to render apparent the need of protection against Canadian aggression.

If Canada should abolish all the protective measures which

she now maintains in force under the Macdonald government, and in lieu thereof enact the very counterpart of the McKinley act, her commercial, industrial, and transportation interests would not be half so much protected as they are under the provisions of the Canadian import tariff, export tariff, orders-in-council, and special acts of Parliament now in force.

In the light of these facts the people of this country regard with favor our protective duties upon wheat, corn, barley, potatoes, onions, poultry, and eggs, which duties apply chiefly to Canadian products. Mr. Erastus Wiman has clearly proved to the Canadian farmers that if they could secure the privilege of free "broilers"—*i. e.*, half-grown chickens—in the New York market, it would make them all rich. The McKinley act simply secures this richness to American farmers.

The assertion of Sir John Macdonald at Halifax that the object of the McKinley bill is to force Canada to annexation to the United States is simply ridiculous. No such purpose has been avowed or even hinted at in the entire tariff discussion, and Lord Macauley long ago explained that no political party can possibly cherish purposes other than those which it openly avows, for the simple reason that, in the nature of things, a political party can have no secrets.

The people of Canada will grossly deceive themselves if they shall assume for a moment that the Free Trade party in the United States will attempt to make headway against the cause of protection in this country by anything which may fall from the lips of so extreme, so unjust, and so aggressive a Canadian Protectionist as Sir John Macdonald.

JOSEPH NIMMO, JR.

WASHINGTON, *October* 13, 1890.

